Side, no specific time limit can be given for settling all the pending items. Both the Official Side and Staff Side seek settlement of such items as early as possible.

USSR pressure on India to buy WER-440 Atomic power plant

3114. SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that USSR is p-esurising the Government to buy WER-440 type nuclear power plant ■which is based on an outmoded technology and none of the reactors under construc tion in USSR is of WER-440 type; and

(b) if so, whether Government propose to buy these atomic power plants from USSR; if so, what are the reasons there for?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECH-NOLOGY AND MINISTER OF STATE , IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF OCEAN DEVELOPMENT, ATOMIC ENERGY; ELECTRONICS AND SPACE (SHRI K. R. NARAYANAN); (a) No, Sir.

(b) Government of USSR has offered tc assist India in the setting up of 440 MWe pressurised light water reactors us-inc; enriched uranium. Discussions are continuing on technical economic and other aspects of the offer.

Disparities in the Regialnaf development

3115. SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA; Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) what achievements have been made in removing disparities in regional development during the successive Five Year Plins in the country stating the areas in which a balanced development in the various regions has been achieved;

(b) which of the State Governments have shown unsatisfactory results in removing the disparities in the development of regions of their respective States and what are the areas in which wide dispari-tie. in development continue to exist statin: the comparative percentage of people below the poverty line in these regions as I against the percentage of people below the poverty line in the developed regions; and

(c) what are the details of the plans and strategies drawn up by Government for removal of disparities in regional development stating the nature and the quantum of the Central assistance proposed to be given to the various State Governments to implement the programme?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI SUKH RAM); (a) and (b) The development of backward region, within the States is the responsibility of the State Government concerned. Several States have identified backward regions within their respective territories and adopted an additive funding approach for accelerating their development. Similarly, the Centre has taken measures for accelerating the development of relatively backward States broadly classified as Special Category States (Assam, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Manipur, Tripura, Skkim, Jammu and Kashmir, and Himachal Pradesh), which have a weak resource base and also relatively low capacity to mobilise their own resources; and the States whosg per capita income is less than the national average (Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan). Statement-I showing the comparative position regarding the percentage of population below the poverty line in these two categories of States and in other States in the year 1977-78 and 1983-84 is enclosed *(See below).*

(c) Details of the measures being taken to remove inter-State disparities in development include the following;

(i) transfer of resources from the Central Government to the State Governments for meeting their Plan expenditure according to a formula which is weighted in favour of the backward States whose per capita income is below the national average;

(ii) devolution of non-Plan resources in accordance with the award °f the Eighth Finance Commission which favours the backward States and seeks tr reduce regional imbalances between the States in addition to covering the *•• venue gaps;

(iii) providing Special Central Assistance for the development of backward areas in the States such as, hill areas, desert areas, drought-prone areas and also areas having concentration of tribal population;

• (iv) Setting up North Eastern Council for the integrated and coordinated development of North Eastern Region comprising five States of Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland and Tripura and two Union Territories of Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram whose plan is totally funded by Central Assistance; and

(v) providing special incentives in the form of investment subsidy, transport subsidy, subsidy for infra-structural development and concessional finance **for** accelerating the industrial development of the industrially backward regions in the States.

Statement-II showing thg provision of Central Assistance for the Drought Prone Area Programme, Desert Development Programme, Hill Area Development **Pro**-gnmme and for Tribal Sub-Plans in the Seventh Five Year Plan is enclosed.

Statement-I

Percentage of Population below the Poverty line in the States

Sl.No.	Name of the State	1977-78 (Revised)	1983-84 (Provisional)
A.	*SPECIAL CATEGORY STATES :*		
1.	Assam	47·3	23·5
2.	Meghalaya	47·4	28·0
3.	Manipur	28·7	12·3
4.	Nagaland	21·1	27·1
5.	Tripura	60·5	23·0
6.	Himachal Pradesh	27·0	13·5
7.	Jammu & Kashmir	33·4	16·3
8.	Sikkim	21·1	27·1
B.	*STATES WHOSE PER CAPTIA INCOME IS BELOW NATIONAL AVERAGE*		
9.	Andhra Pradesh	43·6	36·4
10.	Bihar	56·3	49·5
11.	Madhya Pradesh	58·9	46·2
12.	Orissa	65·1	42·8
13.	Rajasthan	33·6	34·3
14.	Uttar Pradesh	49·7	45·3
C.	*OTHER STATES*		
15.	Gujarat	38·9	24·3
16.	Haryana	25·2	15·6
17.	Karnataka	50·8	35·0
18.	Kerala	48·4	26·8
19.	Maharashtra	50·6	34·9
20.	Punjab	16·4	13·8
21.	Tamil Nadu	52·8	39·6
22.	West Bengal	52·2	39 2
	ALL INDIA	48 3	37 4

N.B. Nagaland, Sikkim and all Union Territories have been grouped for working out the poverty ratio.

Statement–II

Provision of Central Assistance for Various Area Development in Seven Plan

(Rs. Crores)

Sl. No.	Name of States	DPAP	DDP	HADP	Tribal Area sub Plan
A.	*Special Category*				
1	Assam	..	..	118·20	31·92
2	Himachal Pradesh	..	12·50	..	10·14
3	Jammu & Kashmir	4·68	12·50	..	..
4	Manipur	..	..	..	12·51
5	Meghalaya	..	..	..	..
6	Nagaland	..	..	..	..
7	Sikkim	..	..	..	1·77
8	Tripura	..	..	..	10·81
B.	*Non-Special Category whose per capita NSDP is below National average :*				
9	Andhra Pradesh	24·84	..	..	36·54
10	Bihar	19·44	..	..	95·89
11	Madhya Pradesh	17·64	..	..	199·07
12	Orissa	14·04	..	..	93·13
13	Rajasthan	10·80	189·50	..	47·25
14	Uttar Pradesh	31·32	..	553·50	0.90
C.	*Others*				
15	Gujarat	15·48	9·84	..	56·51
16	Haryana	3·24	20·60	..	..
17	Karnataka	25·56	..	28·20	5·03
18	Kerala	..	..	23·80	3·13
19	Maharashtra	26·64	..	38·10	45·17
20	Punjab	..	..	..	..
21	Tamil Nadu	15·48	..	53·65	6·76
22	West Bengal	12·24	..	44·55	28·33
	TOTAL :	221·40**	244·94*	860·00	684·86†

*Expected Rs. 245·00 crores.

DPAP—Drought Prone Area Programme
DDP—Desert Development Programme
HADP—Hill Area Development Programme

**Total central provision Rs. 237·00 crores. The balance of Rs. 15·60 crores includes expenditure on Central Cell, research / evaluation study and marignal additional assistance to block having larger geogrophical area.

†The balance out of Rs. 756 crores will be allotted on ascertaining States requirement—includes family oriented programme.